



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/660,882	09/13/2000	Frank Preiss	99P7765US01	7076

26161 7590 01/09/2006

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

MEW, KEVIN D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2664

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/660,882

Applicant(s)

PREISS, FRANK

Examiner

Kevin Mew

Art Unit

2664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8-10 and 12-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8-10 and 12-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's remarks/arguments filed on 10/12/2005 regarding claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-17 have been considered. Claims 3, 7, 11 and 18 have been canceled by the Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lamb (USP 6,587,454).

Regarding claim 1, Lamb discloses a processor for use in a Voice-over-Internet Protocol telephone (MAC/DSP circuits, element 61, Fig. 4), including:

a Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor core (MAC/DSP circuits, element 60, Fig. 4) operable to transmit computer data and voice data over a computer network (voice packets are transmitted onto network hub, col. 6, lines 35-43 and element 54, Fig. 4);

a bus (node core logic, element 60, Fig. 4) on which signals internal to the processor (MAC/DSP circuits, element 61, Fig. 4) are routed;

memory (downstream packet network port, element 52, Fig. 4) coupled to the Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor core (downstream packet network port coupled to the core

MAC/DSP circuits, elements 52, 61, Fig. 4) through the bus (node core logic, element 60, Fig. 4);

one or more communication ports (upstream packet network port, element 51, Fig. 4) coupled to the Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor core (upstream packet network port 51 coupled to the core MAC/DSP circuits, elements 51, 61, Fig. 4) and memory (downstream packet network port, element 52, Fig. 4) through the bus (through the node core logic, element 60, Fig. 4),

a repeater (node core logic 60 comprises a repeater, col. 6, lines 1-24) coupled to the Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor core (the repeater coupled to the core MAC/DSP circuits, element 61, Fig. 4) through the bus (through the node core logic, element 60, Fig. 4); and

wherein the Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor core (MAC/DSP circuits, element 61, Fig. 4) transmits the computer data and the voice data (MAC/DSP transmits computer and voice data, col. 6, lines 25-43), and wherein the repeater (the repeater, col. 6, lines 1-24 and element 60, Fig. 4), the one or more communication ports (upstream packet network port, element 51, Fig. 4) and the one or more IEEE 802.3 MACs (IEEE 802.x MAC, col. 6, lines 17-34 and element 61, Fig. 4) are each integrated onto a same chip (upstream packet network port is integrated onto the same adaptor 50, Fig. 4) as the Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor core (as the MAC/DSP circuits, element 61, Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 5, Lamb discloses the processor of claim 1, wherein the one or more communication ports (upstream packet network port) allow the Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor core to be coupled to one or more external components (upstream packet network port

allows the core MAC/DSP circuits to be coupled to network, element 61, Fig. 4) without external interfacing circuitry (without external interfacing circuitry, Fig. 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamb, and further in view of Anandakumar et al. (USP 6,574,213)

Regarding claim 2, Lamb discloses the processor of claim 1, except fails to disclose the one or more communication ports further include one or more pulse code modulation (PCM) ports.

However, Anandakumar discloses a Voice-over-Internet Protocol network processor (DSP, see Fig. 15) that implements one or more ports in PCM (col. 24, lines 61-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Lamb, Zimmerman, and Kramer with the teaching of using PCM in Anandakumar such that one or more ports disclosed in Lamb is a PCM port.

3. Claims 4, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamb, and further in view of Zimmerman et al. (US Patent 6,526,131).

Regarding claim 4, Lamb discloses all the aspects of the claimed invention set forth in the rejection of claim 1 above, except fails to explicitly disclose that the one or more communication ports further include one or more universal serial bus (USB) ports.

However, Zimmerman discloses a connectivity box (a processor), which comprises of a processor subsystem and memory, would accept VoIP calls (see lines 24-26, col. 22) and comprises a USB peripheral connect interface (see lines 66-67, col. 7 and lines 1-4, col. 8) to devices such as scanner and printer (see element 31, Figure 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the VoIP processor of Lamb such that one or more of integrated communication ports enclosed therein would be USB ports such as the USB ports of the VoIP processor taught by Zimmerman. The motivation to do so is to provide the capability for the VoIP processor to support USB ports because it would allow the VoIP telephone to connect to some USB compatible peripheral devices such as scanners or printers.

Regarding claim 6, Lamb discloses an apparatus, comprising:

a single-chip Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor (core MAC/DSP circuits, element 61, Fig. 4) operable to transmit computer data and voice data over a computer network (transmits voice packets onto network hub, col. 6, lines 35-43 and element 54, Fig. 4);

a flexible peripheral interconnect bus (node core logic, element 60, Fig. 4);

one or more communication ports (upstream packet network port, element 51, Fig. 4) coupled to the Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor (upstream packet network port 51 coupled to the core MAC/DSP circuits, elements 51, 61, Fig. 4) through the FPI bus (through the node core logic, element 60, Fig. 4),

a repeater (node core logic 60 comprises a repeater, col. 6, lines 1-24) coupled to the Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor core (the repeater coupled to the core MAC/DSP circuits, element 61, Fig. 4) through the bus (through the node core logic, element 60, Fig. 4); and

wherein the Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor core (MAC/DSP circuits, element 61, Fig. 4) transmits the computer data and the voice data (MAC/DSP transmits computer and voice data, col. 6, lines 25-43), and

a repeater (a repeater, col. 6, lines 1-24 and element 60, Fig. 4) integrated onto the same chip (integrated onto the same adaptor 50, Fig. 4) through the FPI bus (through the node core logic, element 60, Fig. 4)

one or more IEEE 802.3 MACs (IEEE 802.x MAC, col. 6, lines 17-34 and element 61, Fig. 4) are each integrated onto a same chip (upstream packet network port is integrated onto the same adaptor 50, Fig. 4) through the FPI bus (through the node core logic, element 60, Fig. 4).

Lamb does not explicitly disclose that the one or more communication ports are universal serial bus (USB) ports.

However, Zimmerman discloses a connectivity box (a processor), which comprises of a processor subsystem and memory, would accept VoIP calls (see lines 24-26, col. 22) and

comprises a USB peripheral connect interface (see lines 66-67, col. 7 and lines 1-4, col. 8) to devices such as scanner and printer (see element 31, Figure 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the VoIP processor of Lamb with the teaching of Zimmerman such that one or more of communication ports integrated onto the single chip of Lamb's VoIP processor through the FPI bus would be USB ports such as the USB ports of the VoIP processor taught by Zimmerman.

The motivation to do so is to provide the capability for the VoIP processor to support USB ports because it would allow the VoIP telephone to connect to some USB compatible peripheral devices such as scanners or printers.

4. Claims 8, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamb as in view of Zimmerman et al. (US Patent 6,526,131), and in further view of Anandakumar (USP 6,574,213).

Regarding claim 8, the combined system of Lamb and Zimmerman discloses all the aspects of the claimed invention set forth in the rejection of claim 6 above, except fails to disclose wherein the single-chip Voice-over-Internet Protocol network processor (the adaptor 50, Fig. 4) further includes the one or more ports are pulse code modulation (PCM) ports.

However, Anandakumar discloses a Voice-over-Internet Protocol network processor (DSP, see Fig. 15) that implements one or more ports that PCM (col. 24, lines 61-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Lamb and Zimmerman with the teaching of using PCM in Anandakumar such that one or more ports disclosed in Lamb is a PCM port.

The motivation to do so is to provide voice coding functionality for voice samples in the adaptor of Lamb.

Regarding claim 9, the combined system of Lamb, Zimmerman and Anandakumar discloses the apparatus of claim 8, Anandakumar further discloses each PCM port is operable to handle up to 30 time slots (24 time slots, see line 34, col. 28) and wherein each time slot is capable of handling a 64K bit/sec voice channel (PCM is 64kbps, see col. 24, lines 61-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Lamb and Zimmerman with the teaching of using PCM in Anandakumar such that one or more ports disclosed in Lamb is a PCM port.

The motivation to do so is to provide voice coding functionality for voice samples in the adaptor of Lamb such that it conforms with the G.711 PCM voice coding standard.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamb in view of Zimmerman et al. (US Patent 6,526,131), and further in view of Kramer et al. (USP 6,658,027).

Regarding claim 10, Lamb discloses an apparatus, comprising:

a single-chip Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor (MAC/DSP circuits, element 61, Fig. 4) operable to transmit computer data and voice data over a computer network (transmits voice packets onto network hub, col. 6, lines 35-43 and element 54, Fig. 4);

a flexible peripheral interconnect bus (node core logic, element 60, Fig. 4);
one or more communication ports (upstream packet network port, element 51, Fig. 4)
coupled to the Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor (upstream packet network port 51 coupled
to the core MAC/DSP circuits, elements 51, 61, Fig. 4) through the FPI bus (through the node
core logic, element 60, Fig. 4),

a repeater (node core logic 60 comprises a repeater, col. 6, lines 1-24) coupled to the
Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor core (the repeater coupled to the core MAC/DSP circuits,
element 61, Fig. 4) through the bus (through the node core logic, element 60, Fig. 4); and

wherein the Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor (MAC/DSP circuits, element 61, Fig.
4) transmits the computer data and the voice data (MAC/DSP transmits computer and voice data,
col. 6, lines 25-43), and

a repeater (a repeater, col. 6, lines 1-24 and element 60, Fig. 4) integrated onto the same
chip (integrated onto the same adaptor 50, Fig. 4) through the FPI bus (through the node core
logic, element 60, Fig. 4); and

one or more IEEE 802.3 MACs (IEEE 802.x MAC, col. 6, lines 17-34 and element 61,
Fig. 4) are each integrated onto a same chip (upstream packet network port is integrated onto the
same adaptor 50, Fig. 4) through the FPI bus (through the node core logic, element 60, Fig. 4).

Lamb does not explicitly disclose that the one or more communication ports are universal
serial bus (USB) ports.

However, Zimmerman discloses a connectivity box (a processor), which comprises of a
processor subsystem and memory, would accept VoIP calls (see lines 24-26, col. 22) and

comprises a USB peripheral connect interface (see lines 66-67, col. 7 and lines 1-4, col. 8) to devices such as scanner and printer (see element 31, Fig. 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the VoIP processor of Lamb with the teaching of Zimmerman such that one or more of communication ports integrated onto the single chip of Lamb's VoIP processor through the FPI bus would be USB ports such as the USB ports of the VoIP processor taught by Zimmerman.

The motivation to do so is to provide the capability for the VoIP processor to support USB ports because it would allow the VoIP telephone to connect to some USB compatible peripheral devices such as scanners or printers.

The combined system of Lamb and Zimmerman does not disclose a memory unit coupled to the Voice-over-Internet Protocol processor, the memory unit operable to store programs used by the Voice-over-Internet Protocol network processor.

However, Kramer discloses a VoIP chip comprises a DSP that includes a ROM for containing software instructions (col. 6, lines 52-67, col. 7, lines 1-21).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the VoIP processor of Lamb and Zimmerman with the teaching of Kramer such that the DSP circuit of Lamb comprises a memory unit operable to store programs used by the Voice-over-Internet Protocol network processor.

The motivation to do so is to provide a memory to store software instructions for performing voice detecting and vocoding activities.

6. Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamb in view of Zimmerman et al. (US Patent 6,526,131), and of Kramer et al. (USP 6,658,027), and in further view of Anandakumar (USP 6,574,213).

Regarding claim 12, the combined system of Lamb, Zimmerman and Kramer discloses the system of claim 10, except fails to disclose the port is a PCM port.

However, Anandakumar discloses a Voice-over-Internet Protocol network processor (DSP, see Fig. 15) that implements one or more ports in PCM (col. 24, lines 61-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Lamb, Zimmerman, and Kramer with the teaching of using PCM in Anandakumar such that one or more ports disclosed in Lamb is a PCM port.

The motivation to do so is to provide voice coding functionality for voice samples in the adaptor of Lamb.

Regarding claim 13, the combined system of Lamb, Zimmerman, Kramer and Anandakumar discloses the system of claim 12. Anandakumar further discloses each PCM port is operable to handle up to 30 time slots (24 time slots, see line 34, col. 28) and wherein each time slot is capable of handling a 64K bit/sec voice channel (PCM is 64kbps, see col. 24, lines 61-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of Lamb, Zimmerman, and Kramer with the

teaching of using PCM in Anandakumar such that one or more ports disclosed in Lamb is a PCM port.

The motivation to do so is to provide voice coding functionality for voice samples in the adaptor of Lamb such that it conforms with the G.711 PCM voice coding standard.

Regarding claim 14, the combined system of Lamb, Zimmerman, Kramer and Anandakumar discloses the system of claim 12. Lamb further comprising a digital-to-analog/analog-to-digital (DA/AD) converter connected to the single-chip Voice-over-Internet Protocol network processor (MAC/DSP circuits perform AD/DA conversion, element 61, Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 15, the combined system of Lamb, Zimmerman, Kramer and Anandakumar discloses the system of claim 14. Lamb further discloses comprising a microphone (telephone, element 10, Fig. 2), a speaker (element 10, Fig. 2), and a handset (see element 10, Fig. 2), each connected to the single-chip Voice-over-Internet Protocol network processor through the DA/AD converter (telephone 10 coupled to the MAC/DSP circuits, Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 16, the combined system of Lamb, Zimmerman, Kramer and Anandakumar discloses the system of claim 15. Lamb further discloses the system of claim 15, further comprising a keypad interfaced with the single-chip Voice-over-Internet Protocol network processor, the keypad operable to allow a user to dial telephone numbers (telephone, element 10, Fig. 2).

7. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamb in view of Zimmerman et al. (US Patent 6,526,131), Kramer et al. (USP 6,658,027), Anandakumar (USP 6,574,213), and in further view of Edholm (USP 6,449,269).

Regarding claim 17, the combined system of Lamb, Zimmerman, Kramer and Anandakumar discloses all the aspects of the claimed invention set forth in the rejection of claim 16 above, except fails to explicitly disclose the system of claim 16, further comprising a liquid crystal display (LCD) operable to display information entered through the keypad.

However, Edholm discloses a connectivity box (a system) that comprises of a VoIP telephone (see lines 27-30, col. 4 and element 100, Fig. 2) with a LCD display operable to display the digits keyed in via keypad of the IP telephone (see lines 36-52, col. 5 and element 260, Fig. 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the VoIP system of Lamb with the VoIP telephone of Edholm such that a LCD display is interfaced with the VoIP processor of the VoIP telephone to display information entered through the keypad such as LCD display of the VoIP telephone taught by Edholm. The motivation to do so is to provide inexpensive output screen on the IP telephone to display user feedback regarding the digits keyed in via keypad of the IP telephone and/or status of the phone itself because it will reduce the development and manufacturing costs of the IP telephone.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Mew whose telephone number is 571-272-3141. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on 571-272-3134. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Ajit Patel
Primary Examiner